

REMARKS

Claims 1, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 22 have been amended.

The Examiner has rejected applicant's claims 1 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by the Hendricks, et al. (US 6,463,585) patent. The Examiner has also rejected applicant's claims 4-6, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hendricks, et al. patent in view of the Wehmeyer, et al. (US 5,867,226) patent. Applicant's claims 9 and 11-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hendricks, et al. patent in view of the Wehmeyer, et al. patent and further in view of the Sullivan (US 6,591,421) patent. Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hendricks, et al. patent, claims 17-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hendricks, et al. patent in view of the Sullivan patent, and claims 19-20 and 22-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hendricks, et al. patent in view of the Ismail, et al. (US 6,614,987) patent. Claims 21 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hendricks, et al. patent in view of the Ismail, et al. patent and in further view of the Wehmeyer, et al. patent. With respect to applicant's independent claims, as amended, and their respective dependent claims, the Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

As a basis for all the Examiner's rejections, the Examiner has argued that the Hendricks, et al patent discloses a system which performs the process of "listening/viewing reservation." The Examiner has then argued that the language in applicant's independent claims of a plurality of processes, wherein the plurality of processes include at least one of processes of program record reservation, listening/viewing reservation, and program data reproduction can be read to mean either "a program record reservation," "a listening/reviewing

reservation,” or “a program data reproduction.” Finally, the Examiner further argues that since the Hendricks, et al patent discloses “a listening/viewing reservation” the patent satisfies applicant’s aforementioned claim language.

Applicant’s, however, have now amended applicant’s independent claims to delete the recited process of “a listening/viewing reservation.” Thus amended independent claim 1 recites “processing means for executing a plurality of processes, wherein the plurality of processes include at least one of processes of program record reservation and program data reproduction.” Amended independent claim 16 recites “executing each of the plurality of processes in accordance with the assigned code, wherein the plurality of processes include at least one of processes of program record reservation and program data reproduction.” Amended independent claim 17 recites “processing means for executing a plurality of processes, wherein the plurality of processes include at least one of processes of program record reservation and program data reproduction.”

Amended claim 18 recites “a signal processing apparatus which automatically assigns each program whose program data and program information have been input to the signal processing apparatus with a unique code corresponding to the process to be executed to the program and executes each of the plurality of processes, wherein the plurality of processes include at least one of processes of program record reservation and program data reproduction.” Amended independent claim 19 recites “assigning means for assigning a code to each of the plurality of programs received by said receiving means corresponding to the process to be executed to the program, wherein the process includes at least one of processes of program record reservation and program data reproduction.” Finally, amended independent claim 22 recites “signal processing apparatus assigning a code to each of the programs of the received

television signal corresponding to the process to be executed by the program, wherein the process includes at least one of processes of program record reservation and program data reproduction."


Applicant's independent claims 1, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 22 are thus no longer within the teachings of the Hendricks, et al patent. Such claims, and their respective dependent claims, therefore, patentably distinguish over such patent. Moreover, the other cited patents, i.e., the Wehmeyer, et al. patent, the Sullivan patent and the Ismail, et al. patent fail to add anything to the Hendricks, et al. patent to change this conclusion. Thus, applicant's amended claims patentably distinguish over all these patents.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicant's claims, as amended, patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Dated: August 31, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P.C.  
1133 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
(212) 790-9273

  
John J. Torrente  
Reg. No. 26,359  
Attorney for Applicant